

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~
~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

Special Meeting on Promotion Policy

Tuesday, 20 April 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

P³
27

DOCUMENT NO. _____
NO CHANGE IN CLASS ☐
☐ RECLASSIFIED
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S 2011
NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
AUTH: HR 70-2
DATE 2 JUL 1981 REVIEWER: 02595

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD
Special Meeting on Promotion Policy

Tuesday, 20 April 1954

4:00 p.m.

DCI Conference Room
Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General, Chairman

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DC/PP, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
SA/DD/A

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
AD/Communications, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
DAD/P

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
AD/Personnel, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
C/DDP/Admin, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
SA/DD/I, Alt. for DD/I, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]
Reporter

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

. . . A special meeting of the CIA Career Service Board on the subject of Promotion Policy, convened Tuesday, 20 April 1954, at 4:00 p.m., in the DCI Conference Room, Administration Building, with Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's start right in with paragraph 1, "General".

Any differences of opinion on paragraph 1? Mr. [REDACTED]? 25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Well, Ted and I are in agreement, Kirk, that whether or not this thing may be desirable in theory, that in practice it simply can't be put into effect because we don't have the mechanisms right from the ground up to put it into effect. The ground on which you have to start on something like this is a system of personnel evaluations which lend themselves to this sort of treatment, plus some sort of system to make sure that there is some reasonable uniformity in the judgments that are made. We have just gone through the business of adopting a new personnel evaluation form, which is very useful if it is properly filled out and then examined individually, one by one. But that doesn't lend itself at all to the machine-type of treatment that I think you would have to set up for the proposal herein propounded. Consequently, I think that at this stage we are going a bit too far when we try to adopt an across-the-board comparison of individual by individual in every single grade either for promotion or to fill vacant slots.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, John, that the best thing to try to do is to see if we can get a regulation out of what has been drafted and take it paragraph by paragraph and see what the controversial matters are. I don't gather, from what you have just said, that this paragraph 1 on "General" contains anything you would object to. This is just a general statement. I think what you start objecting to is paragraph 2.a., the first sentence.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That is right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comments on the first paragraph? Can we have at least the achievement of agreeing on the first paragraph?

All right, let's go on to paragraph 2.a.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I recommend we eliminate the first sentence from paragraph 2.a. and go on from there.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The only point I would make on that is this: Don't you think, Ted, that some day we are going to have to come to this?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Some day we may, but I should say that that day, based

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

on our progress to date and on what is in the mill, is somewhere in the future.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You said two years last Thursday and I said I thought it would be much shorter. We have checked since then on the machine end of it and provided we get an adjective rating on the PER there is a very distinct possibility that it will be in the near future.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Even if you have an adjective rating in the PER how are we going to judge between a mass of people with the same adjective rating? It has to be refined considerably beyond that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If they had the same rating, Ted, it wouldn't be an offer of substitution for the person that was proposed by the office concerned, for the promotion. I can see at the outset, under this policy, we probably would offer a substitute candidate maybe in three cases out of ten. I think most of them would go on through as they do at the present time. But we are thinking of people that maybe have been with the Agency for some time, that are in dead end streets, and there are new people who have come in in the last two years who are going right on by those people insofar as promotions are concerned. And by virtue of being in a dead end street those people aren't getting any consideration whatsoever for the promotions that are going in.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: For example?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: For example, we may have two people coming in from the same school. One will go into OCD, on initial placement, as a Grade 7 librarian. About the most that person could hope for in that job down there would be a Grade 9, or possibly an 11 over a long period of time. If that person comes in at the Grade 7 level and his or her roommate at college comes in at the Grade 7 level in another section of the Agency and is slotted against a job two or three grades higher than Grade 7, it is conceivable that person could be an 11 while the classmate who was slotted against a job in OCD would be there for three or four years in a dead end street. Now this is talking about vacancies, you must remember.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If you are talking about two librarians, that is one thing. If you are talking about an individual who would like to take a job as a librarian and one who would like to take a job as an operational officer in the SR Division - you have an altogether different breed of cat there. Your librarian can't conceivably, because of the atmosphere he lives in and the work that he does, be qualifying himself for the next higher grade - as an operational officer in the next higher grade.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In that case we wouldn't offer that person as a better qualified candidate than the proposed person being promoted in the SR Division. That would be a clear-cut case. For a specialist there probably wouldn't be any competition for the job, other than the person himself.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Within the DD/P area we are rapidly acquiring both the mechanics and capability to handle that sort of situation.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This doesn't propose to shoot at a person who is in definite training for this job in the SR Division. There is a type of job where I see that this would work. I could take some jobs in General [REDACTED] area, for example, where we are bringing new teletype operators in and they are going up to a 5 and 6 in no time, while in [REDACTED] we have 4's 25X1A8 over there who have been with the Agency several years. Now when he proposes a person for one of those jobs that has a vacancy, what we propose to do is hire a person at a lower grade and give him to [REDACTED] and transfer a person 25X1A8 from there to General [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Don't you have the opportunity to do that now?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: No, it's not done now.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Isn't the opportunity available? Doesn't that transfer or procurement activity have to be handled in the Personnel Office at some point?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: It is not. It is only possible if he happens to have a vacancy down there and does not happen to have a candidate of his own for that position. Now we definitely propose if he has a grade 5 teletype operator--

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: The only difficulty there is that I don't have teletype operators per se, they are crypto people and they have had crypto training. That doesn't engage your argument, but a good man in OO who is stuck in a Grade 4, couldn't ^{he} take six weeks crypto training and come in in lieu of a recruit.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I have two suggestions I would like to make. The first suggestion is this, that rather than hang ourselves up in this thing, in this particular sentence, although a large part of policy is inherent in this sentence, that we pass on and see if we are in general agreement on the rest of the regulation, and then return to this and consider the question as to rather than putting this in a regulation at the present time we agree not to put it in the regulation but do agree to ask the Personnel Office to put

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

it into practice and see how it works in practice. In other words, when a promotion comes through, say, to a 15, that the Personnel Office look around at all the 14's and see how that works on a practical basis over a period of six months, and see whether in actual practice it comes out the way it should.

25X1A9a MR. SHANNON: I think that is quite reasonable, because I think a statement of policy this broad and across-the-board is in effect announcing a policy that it is impossible to comply with.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I agree with you, (indicating Mr. [REDACTED]), but 25X1A9a I also agree with you (indicating Mr. Kirkpatrick) - let's do it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: To the extent practical and feasible.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are all agreed that ultimately we want competitive promotions, but rather than tying us down and getting us into a position where it is a regulation that we have to obey, we can have agreement that it is what we want to do and see how it works out in practice. What do you think, George?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Well, I have to be honest - I would like to stick to this. We must remember that this says, "...whenever a position vacancy exists...." - and I can't see any objection, when any element of this Agency has a vacancy, to consider everybody within the Agency for that vacancy.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: How are you going to do it?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I can't see why we can't do it, Ted. If we go outside and recruit people for these vacancies why can't we recruit from within for those jobs? This isn't as if you had somebody in your own office that you were booming for a promotion.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This is a promotion policy. This is not a procurement policy.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's tied right in. It says, "...whenever a position vacancy exists, every person in the Agency at the same or next lower grade possessing the required talents and skills for the position be accorded consideration for selection to the position."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: To the extent that we have any sort of a basis for selection, isn't that being done?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: No, it isn't being done, and we haven't been in a

25X1A9a position to ask that you or [REDACTED] or any other element of the Agency, turn your good people loose for a job in OCD, or any other element of the Agency, when you have had two or three thousand vacancies staring you

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

in the face.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's not true--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's not true today and it's going to be less true if we delay something like this for another two years. We are getting filled up to where people are no longer slotted against jobs within three grades below their present job.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's yield on that particular matter because we could spend the entire afternoon discussing that one thing.

The next sentence reads: "The promotion of Agency employees will be based on consideration of their qualifications and demonstrated abilities in relation to Agency needs." Any objection to that sentence?

The next sentence: "Every effort will be made to fill newly created or vacant positions by the promotion or reassignment of qualified Agency employees before external recruitment is undertaken." Any objection to that?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: No, Sir.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paragraph 2.a.(1): "Employees who have completed the minimum Agency experience requirements specified herein, will enter the zone of consideration for promotion and be considered for promotion at least once each year thereafter."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: May I ask about the implications of that, Kirk? Does that mean that only at these periodic considerations may an individual be considered for promotion?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It guarantees at least by that time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the minimum guarantee.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It guarantees, Ted, that we will set up some sort of tickler file to make sure that every one who was in this area would at least have a file review and be given some type of consideration to see whether or not they are not dying on the vine in some remote corner of the Agency.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This is not a restrictive feature?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, not at all.

All right, paragraph 2.a.(2). I think we can just pass over that because it ties right in with the first sentence that we were arguing about.

Paragraph 2.a.(3): "Promotions will be limited to one grade except where double-grade stages have been established as the normal progression within the grade range GS-5 through GS-11.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is a tough one, as I have found out. I

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

decided that the transition from a 7 to a 9 was from an enlisted man to a warrant officer, so I made it a rule that normally it would be 7, 8, 9, unless there were some very extenuating circumstances. That caused a terrific upheaval in my organization, but I believe in it. I believe it should be one grade - 7, 8, 9.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Our classification people are more and more bringing in the 6 and 8.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: On the other hand, there are quite a number of places where actually there are no 6's and 8's.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Those are considered on the merit of the particular case, the place where he has to be assigned, and so forth.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: So if we made it a one-grade step in certain areas nobody would ever be promoted.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It says, "....except where double-grade stages have been established...."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I was speaking to General McClelland's comment that he thought we ought to stick to the 7, 8 and 9.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I believe in this proviso but I believe we can get ourselves into a lot of trouble.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: General [REDACTED] specifically asked us to establish a series of jobs in his Office with that one-grade progression. It is difficult for us to establish some of these jobs and distinguish those in the two-grade step, let alone getting down to--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: They have all come to believe they can do the double jump. [REDACTED] 25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Harry asked me if there was any legal objection to not using the double-grade. We don't normally do it. This doesn't propose that every series of jobs would run from 3 on up through 13, with every step and every grade within that. We would still have the 5, 7, 9 and 11.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: With the ceiling getting tighter it is better to let a man go from a 7 to a 9, rather than waiting a long time to go to that 9.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: One other comment I have on this one - do we want to make just this flat statement or do we want to leave some room to maneuver in? We do have cases--sometimes in the senior grades, too--where double jump promotions are quite warranted and have been given. One case I know was a triple grade - and I think it's quite all right.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. ~~BOULTON~~: The exceptions are in paragraph 7. Anything in here can be excepted - policies, requirements or procedures.

25X1A9a MR. : Kirk, I'm sorry but I will have to excuse myself. But before I go I would like to point out that paragraph 3.a. when read in conjunction with paragraph 3.b. has the effect of cutting out the present and contemplated Career Service systems in the DD/P area and throwing it all back on the area divisions, which I don't think anybody intended to do.

25X1A9a MR. : I have that noted here.

25X1A9a . . . Mr. retired from the meeting . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Now you feel that paragraph 7 establishes sufficient exceptions right across the board?

25X1A9a MR. : Any exceptions in the whole regulation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think paragraph 7.c. covers your point, Ted.

25X1A9a MR. : It was designed to. Whether it does or not, I don't know.

25X1A9a MR. : And should we say in 7.b. - or do you want to wait until you get there? All right. Because I have objection to one word there.

I am in general agreement with the fact that our promotion should be step by step progression as long as there is some room for maneuvering.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other comment on that?

Now, paragraph 3.a. I'm not going to read it. Is there any question on operating officials?

25X1A9a MR. : Yes, the use of the term "Area Divisions". The Chiefs of the Area Divisions do not have career service mechanisms, only the Chiefs of the Senior Staffs.

MR. REYNOLDS: So you want to omit "...and Area Divisions...."?

25X1A9a MR. : Yes, because it doesn't fit the contents of this paper.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any other comments?

25X1A9a MR. : This is an official definition of an operating official.

25X1A9a MR. : That may be but it doesn't fit this paper because our Career Service Boards are geared to the Chiefs of the Senior Staffs and not in any way to the Area Division Chiefs.

25X1A9a MR. : Can't make a recommendation for promotion?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: He can make a recommendation for promotion, yes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is all this says - he is an operating official.

(Reading) "Supervisors at all levels are responsible for considering the promotion of employees under their jurisdiction and for making recommendations to operating officials concerning the promotion of individual employees according to the provisions of this Regulation."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But go on to b.(1) - "...the Operating Official who heads that component has responsibility for reviewing and recommending promotion requests and submitting them to the Assistant Director for Personnel." That doesn't fit the situation at all. All of our promotion requests come from Career Service Boards which are headed by Chiefs of Senior Staffs. So for the purpose of this paper, if the wording is to remain the same the term "Area Divisions" has to be eliminated from 3.a. We don't get any recommendations for promotion from Division Chiefs.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This says that when an employee's career designation corresponds to the organizational component where he is assigned, then the Operating Official who heads that component has the responsibility for re- 25X1A9a viewing and recommending promotion. Take [REDACTED] again, as an example - he would not fit this case because he does not head a Career Service Program 25X1A9a and does not have people with an NEA career designation. General [REDACTED] however, does. He is an Operating Official and is the head of his own career service and will be responsible. He fits both definitions, whereas Kim only fits the definition of Operating Official with responsibility for recommending. This says, "...the organizational component where he is assigned...."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Oh, I see. You are getting down here to b.(2).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Take Jim Garrison, for example - or Matt Baird would be another case. He has his own Career Service and his people are coded to him, so he is an Operating Official and is at the head of his own Career Service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: [REDACTED] would be an Operating Official under 25X1A9a b.(2). Isn't that right, George?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: All of the Area Division Chiefs would fit in 2.b.(2).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's all pitched to the career designations.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is right. Take [REDACTED] again-- 25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I wish you would take somebody else because he

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

just changed jobs. (Laughter)

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In Jim Garrison's case, where the employee career designation does not correspond to NEA - because there isn't any such thing - he recommends to the Career Board concerned. For an FI man his recommendation would be to the FI Career Board that the promotion be processed. If he is recommending that his Personnel man be promoted--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why make this so complicated?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We are trying to spell it out to make it clear.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why list all of the Operating Officials? Why not just require that it be sent through the normal chain of command or communications to the Career Service Board to which the individual is designated - make it that simple. Couldn't we do everything we have in 3. and 4.a. and b. in about two sentences? Then nobody would be confused. Isn't that really what we are saying - that promotions will be processed from the initiating supervisor up through his normal chain of command to the appropriate Career Service Board? Everybody will understand that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't think it has been finally determined that in each instance a Career Service Board will be involved in this. There is a Task Force working now on suggested responsibilities.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Are you going to take this in terms of what may happen?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If this is taken in the context of what we are doing today, the Career Service Board is a Staff Office of the AD, and he can use it as he sees fit.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Even in that context this paper is wrong, then.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This didn't go to Career Service Boards.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes, it does. In either event they go to the Career Service Board.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Technically they go to the head of that Career Service, but it's up to him whether it's referred to the Board or not.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: All right, I would accept that change - to the head of the Career Service component.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is the way this is supposed to be written.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I still think you can do it in one sentence.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe we can't with this divergence in systems across the Agency. Why don't we play with this as we've got it? If you want to strike "Area Divisions" why I would--

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Well, Area Divisions fit in except that as sure as God made little apples a number of people are going to be confused, just as 25X1A9a I was initially, and [REDACTED] still is. But if we use the heads of Career Services--

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If we change it that way, that does it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We haven't mentioned Career Boards.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Paragraph c. says that - Career Services.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are still hung up on 3.a. - operating officials - from the question of whether Area Divisions are operating officials.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: From the context of this paper in b.(1) and b.(2) - that is a proper definition.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No further comment on Operating Officials?

Paragraph b. - Heads of Career Services? 3.b. is all right with you, Ted?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paragraph 4. - Supervisors. Any comment on 4.a.? On 4.b. - Operating Officials?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I thought "recommending promotion requests" was a little bit redundant. A promotion is a recommendation per se.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Just put an "s" on promotion and scratch out the "requests".

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That will do it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any further comment on the first sentence?

The second sentence: "Promotion requests which are not favorably considered by the Operating Official need not be submitted to the Assistant Director for Personnel." Any disagreement on that?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: To back up for just a minute - in this first sentence I'd say "for reviewing and recommending promotion actions". The grammar is a little better. We don't review promotions.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You review the actions.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I had a thought here. Whenever I make a recommendation for a promotion to the Assistant Director for Personnel it implies that I have reviewed all of the people who have qualifications for this job and that I have selected the one best qualified. I don't know whether this is the time

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to put that in or not, that the Operating Official has reviewed all people who have those qualifications and that he has selected the one best qualified. We are getting down to the point where it is "best qualified" and not just "qualified" - because of the lack of head room.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I realize a lot of things happen around here but to me, at least, that is an inherent responsibility of any supervisor, to pick his best man. 25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: It's not always done.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But the fact that it is not always done - by the fact that we require a statement to that effect we may have altered an actual situation where an individual isn't going to pick his best man automatically.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It would probably keep him in line. I just threw it in. It was good for the troops.

MR. MELOON: It makes good reading.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's good for the troops to know that the guy selected is considered the "best" qualified. A lot of them figure, "Well, I've been in here for two years and I am entitled to an ll."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I certainly would have no objection to the inclusion of that statement.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have to pick the "best" qualified, not just "qualified".

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Where would that go in?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: "...and recommending promotion actions of those best qualified and submitting them to the Assistant Director for Personnel" - is that what you mean, General?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why not just add a paragraph (3) to b. - because you have what appear to be two different channels.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The wording I had was that Operating Officials or recommending officials be required to state that all employees with the required qualifications for the position have been considered for selection to this position.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Will the supervisors have the resources to do that, though? 25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: When I recommend it that is what I mean, that I have picked the man best qualified in the whole Communications Office. Of

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

course, I don't have access to the others.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Of course, we tried to cover it for the whole Agency back in (2) when we said, "...only after his qualifications for the position have been compared with and found superior to those of all other qualified employees of the same grade...."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't make a point of it, but I thought it would help the people in the field to realize that it is now "best" qualified rather than just "qualified".

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You're getting into the field of inherent responsibilities here. If we can't expect that as an automatic response from the supervisor writing it, then--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But it might have quite a psychological effect.

I would sort of recommend that we make that b.(3).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It certainly doesn't detract from the thing.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I'm getting to the point now where I have 10 people qualified for 3 vacancies and I have to go down and pick the fellow who is head and shoulders above the other fellow. The others don't look at that very favorably, but now we are picking the man who is outstanding.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The one who is "best" qualified.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And so you will pass over people.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's go on to the second sentence of b.(1) -

"Promotion requests which are not favorably considered by the operating official need not be submitted to the Assistant Director for Personnel."

b.(2) - "In those cases when an employee's...."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Excuse me, Kirk. Did we take Ted's amendment - "recommending promotion actions"?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

b.(2) - "In those cases when an employee's career designation does not correspond to his assigned organizational component, the Operating Official who heads the component to which the employee is assigned will review promotion requests and recommend action to the head of the employee's career service. The head of the employee's career service will review such requests and recommend action to the Assistant Director for Personnel."

Any disagreement with that?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I presume that the last sentence of b.(1) is assumed to also apply to b.(2)?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Oh, no - wait a moment. Here again we run into this confusing factor. In b.(1) we refer to the head of the Career Service as the Operating Official and state that he need not submit the requests, and then in b.(2) we refer to him as the head of the Career Service and don't say anything.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I don't think it does apply, and I want to say why. In

the event a promotion action comes in from someplace in the Far East on one

25X1A9a

of [REDACTED] employees, if [REDACTED] doesn't agree with it I still think that Garrison should see that recommended action on one of his employees.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: b.(1) says he need not.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: No, it does not. In case his career designation corresponds he is both head of the Career Service and also the operating man in that

25X1A9a

case. In b.(2) - [REDACTED] is not the head of the Career Service for Logistics, for example, so someone from a lower echelon would recommend one

25X1A9a

of Garrison's people for promotion and [REDACTED] could stand there forever.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I get that. My point is that down here in b.(2) we don't say the head of the employee's Career Service need not send these things to the Assistant Director for Personnel if he disapproves the request.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I agree. It says even if they disapprove, he will recommend as appropriate.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: So up here you refer to the head of the Career Service as an Operating Official in b.(1) and say that he may in effect disapprove promotions. Down here you refer to him as the head of the Career Service and say that he can't disapprove promotions. What is the difference?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: No, we don't, Ted. Could I give you an example? In

25X1A9a

the first case General [REDACTED] is a typical example of the operating man.

He is not only the operating official of Commo but he is also the head of his

25X1A9a

own Career Service, and if he turns down one of his people we are not interest-

ed in seeing that action because we believe that General [REDACTED] is the

man who says whether or not his people should be recommended for promotion.

25X1A9a

Now, in the next case, however, if General [REDACTED] had anyone in his shop

with a career designation other than Commo, which he doesn't, but if there

25X1A9a

was a FE man in General [REDACTED] Office and one of his supervisors at a

lower echelon recommended that man for a promotion - [REDACTED] may 25X1A9a

recommend one of his people for promotion while General [REDACTED] may not

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a want that promotion to go through, for obvious reasons. In that case he still should send that to [REDACTED].

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is covered in (1).

MR. [REDACTED]: No, Sir. This one down here doesn't correspond.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it's perfectly logical.

MR. [REDACTED]: We had one recently on two personnel boys in the Far

25X1A9a East. They came through and [REDACTED] didn't believe they should be promoted. Now he didn't stop those right there, he sent them up to us and our

25X1A9a Career Board went over them and we agreed with [REDACTED] that they should not be promoted, but we might not have agreed with him.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But I think the way this Regulation is worded we are going to get into all kinds of confusion. I don't understand it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Let's say I have a PP man with me and I think he is a hot shot and I recommend him to the PP Staff. This requires that the PP Staff forward that to the Assistant Director for Personnel even if they don't agree. Isn't that the point you are making?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I thought it was.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Frankly I don't know.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: He's the head of that career designation - so there's a question if he shouldn't have the right to kill it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is consistent with (1).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In other words, the promotion requests which are not favorably considered are killed by the head of the Career Service who is also the Operating Official. Now why shouldn't he have the right to kill it under b.(2) as head of the Career Service.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't think it makes much difference, because the head of the Career Service will forward it to you and say, "I disapprove of this recommendation" - and then you wouldn't take any action on it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'm not sure.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: (1) and (2) are not consistent.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think we could take this and say it in a few sentences. I think if we put this thing out we will be compounding confusion in the Agency - the way this thing is worded. It's complicated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The unfortunate thing is - so is our Career Service system right at the moment.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But I do think channels of communication are quite clear and it could be quite simply stated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am not opposed to rewriting it if it could be rewritten more simply.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think if we make one simple statement that recommendations for promotion will be channeled through the normal channels, through the head of the Career Service of the individual concerned, that makes sure that these things get to the responsible, top Career Service official, and at that point they may either recommend or disapprove. Then everybody will clearly understand what the channels are and what the authorities and responsibilities are. I still think you can do it in two sentences rather than with two pages which tend to confuse.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, let's move on, Ted, with your recommendation, shall we say, "pending"?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me we are hung on the last sentence of sub-paragraph (2).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Are we completely agreed on what happens in certain circumstances? If both the head of the component and the career designation head - when the two are different? If they both agree it ought to be rejected does it have to go to Personnel? According to this it would.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Can't you put after "...review such requests and recommend action...." the words "unless unfavorably considered"? Let's insert those words.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: On the other hand, as George says, if one wants it one way and the other the other way then, from George's point of view, it should go to the AD.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is the way I figured.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am inclined to think it should go to AD/P just as a reviewing factor, where a fellow is split between two offices.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In other words, you think the Personnel Director should act as referee between the Chief of an Area Division or my Office and the Chief of the Administrative Career Service Board involved if such a case should come up where there were two different opinions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it would probably create the impression

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

that an employee wasn't going to be arbitrarily dealt with.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Then what do we have the Career Service Boards for?
I thought they were going to be objective.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The point is that the Career Service Boards - well, use any one of the examples we have had so far, say that somebody in Garrison's shop who is working in the Far East gets a recommendation there and the Logistics Career Service Board turns it down for reasons unknown.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Surely not for "reasons unknown".

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But they would obviously not have any direct knowledge of his work in the Far East except through their particular channels and reports. But the people he was working with out there - FE or whoever they may be - think he has done such an outstanding job that he should get a promotion. His Career Service Board turns it down. Would it not make the employee feel that there is a check and balance system if it were reviewed somewhere?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I would object to that. The ones I have of this type are a small, one-man station in South America, very close to the Station Chief. The Station Chief thinks he is a pretty fine guy. He comes in and recommends, without knowing anything about my Office, he strongly recommends that he be made a 9. And I look at it and I turn it down because this boy has only been in the service a year and a half and it would pass him over a lot of his contemporaries.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: From a practical point of view the AD/Personnel is not going to be in a position, in many instances, to over-rule the Career Service Board.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That was the point I was about to make. What is there inherent within the Personnel Office to make them qualified to decide between the two? How are they going to determine that?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That would prevent more people from coming to the IG.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That's not joking. We have a case of a boy right now with a logistics career designation, working in the Far East. The field has recommended him for promotion from 7 to 9. The FE Administrative Office approved it and Garrison's Board has turned him down. Now the FE Personnel people have called me and asked me if I would please review this case. They find that the Logistics Office in turning him down has used an old Civil

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Service standard, and that the same standards aren't used against those people. So they want to know, is this man, in our estimation, qualified for the job or not qualified for the job? And if we don't review such cases I don't think Harry is going to say, "Well, I over-rule this Board" - and they are going to put the promotion through without coming down and discussing it with the head of the Office, and we may find out they may have a lot of reasons that are not obvious.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If you have an FI recommendation from the Division and the FI Board rules it out then it goes to the Personnel Office?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, because that applies under (1).

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If the FI man is in FE.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's exactly the same situation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Take the Area Divisions out again.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: What you are going to do, in my opinion, at least in the DD/P area, if you establish a thing like that, you are going to set Career Service back about a year. You are going to create terrible frictions. I think you know that from your own experience.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: If I can't settle with the AD I think I'll be on the doorstep in the morning. I wouldn't object to that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't think we would insist on promoting him over your objections but we might try to work out a deal with you. If he is persona non grata in your office we might say, "Would you consent to release him to [REDACTED] in this case?" Then the fellow feels, at least, that his case has been reviewed somewhere along the line.

25X1A8

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have had a lot of cases where people close to their supervisors induced them to make recommendations which are all out of line.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: They are going to wind up with us, Ted, or with Kirk and he will refer them to us.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: For some cases I have actually been acting as a buffer between the Career Service Board - and I think fairly effectively, but there will always be a certain amount of argument in some of these cases.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I agree there would be cases that would be a little "sticky", shall we say?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: As a practical matter we are not going to turn down

25X1A9a a recommendation from you or [REDACTED] without saying to you, "Now look, this

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

is the only thought we have in this matter. Does it hold any water?"

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] You referee. Actually, within the DD/P the referee is the Career Service Board. The senior Career Service Board down there takes over.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, let's proceed from this point. I'll mark that as still controversial.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Very controversial.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paragraph c. - Heads of Career Services. Is there any comment on the definition of heads of Career Services?

Paragraph d. - the Assistant Director for Personnel. "The Assistant Director for Personnel is responsible for: (1) Continuous evaluation of the Agency's promotion program." Any objection?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] It ought to be stronger, - insuring compliance with the Regulation.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I'd like to see that in there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection to putting it in there?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: How do we go about it?

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Insuring compliance?

MR. [REDACTED] That is how he goes about it in reviewing promotion actions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's leave that sub-paragraph with "insuring compliance with this Regulation by the continuous evaluation"?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Fair enough.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any objection to that?

Sub-paragraph (2), "Assisting officials at all levels in carrying out their responsibilities in accordance with this Regulation." Any objection?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: No. Paragraph (3) is still quite controversial.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: (3) we will pass.

Paragraph (4), "Recording and disseminating the qualification requirements of all Agency positions to be used as the basis for reviewing promotion requests." That is part of your present responsibilities anyway, is it not?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: 5. - Promotion Requirements. 5.a. - Agency Experience Requirements. "An employee will enter the zone of consideration

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

for promotion when he has served in his current grade for the appropriate period as indicated below." Any objection?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: May I comment on this one? Kirk hates to have me come to a meeting, I know. This goes back to my previous point of when may we recommend people for promotion? If this means literally what it says, I see no objection to it, providing that our previous discussion is still valid, that arriving in a zone of consideration is not necessarily a basic criteria for a promotion recommendation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the very strong feeling of the entire Board, that somebody may arrive in a zone and he may be in that zone for five or six years, without getting penalized, before he even gets promoted.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: But he will be considered once a year.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: In other words, the time-in-grade provision is not a hard and fast requirement before you recommend somebody for promotion. That is what I am getting at. If there is flexibility in that, I buy it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sure.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I'm not sure I understand. You won't recommend before this period?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Except as an exception in paragraph 7.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: If this is going to be a hard and fast criteria.

Personally I think demonstrated qualifications are the proper basis, regardless of time in grade. But if there is enough flexibility to live with it, I won't object.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: One would presume in most of these that months of experience are almost necessary in each instance to determine whether an individual is qualified for the promotion.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: For the general average.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But exceptional people you might see in the first five days.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: But it is felt that exception "c." would take care of any time in grade.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I have had some experience with this, but mine are a little different than this. That made every one settle down and realize they are going to be considered but they can't high pressure a supervisor.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: It can be used as a weapon. On the other hand, it has this invidious effect, and I particularly saw this in the Army, that the

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

blasted thing can come around to being the single criteria for a promotion.

MR. [REDACTED]: We have had to combat that. All this means is that you will be considered. This doesn't qualify you for promotion. In a small organization like mine you can do it, where you couldn't do it in the Army. They had their applications on the desk six months after they were promoted the last time.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have to watch that so very closely. But this has a place if it is administered properly.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any comment on the periods in grade?

The next sentence: "The Office of Personnel will furnish the head of each career service a monthly listing of all members of the career service who have entered the zone of consideration." Any comment?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I have a comment. That is nice but we do it anyway. It's an added burden, but maybe it's good for other people.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think it's good for the great big components.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Why don't we say, "The Office of Personnel, when requested, will...."?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I'd like to get it automatically.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't object to it. I just thought it was duplication. I have a machine run on mine. 25X1A9a

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I know [REDACTED] has a machine run on his, and OCD has, too. I think we should have a machine run for the whole Agency.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's a question of who is duplicating who in this case. I have to say it. (Laughter)

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I agree with you. You do it and I'll check on you for a few months and then I'll drop it. So far we have found out all your figures are different from ours.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I do think this will sharpen everybody.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We would like very much to have this automatically.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I know that thing I did on consultants, I think that sharpened a lot of people up because of a number of discrepancies as between your office figures and the operating office figures - the number was quite large. Well, we won't get invidious.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's DD/A that makes the runs.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your advertisement is noted. (Laughter)

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Paragraph 5.b. - Existence of a Suitable Position. "Formal action requesting the Assistant Director for Personnel to promote an employee will be initiated only when a position of higher grade is available through: (1) The existence of a vacancy in an established T/O position, (2) The establishment of a new T/O position, (3) The reclassification of the employee's current position in recognition of an increase in his duties and responsibilities.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Is there any conceivable way that a promotion vacancy can be created other than these three ways?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Couldn't you ever get an action without them going against something?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I can think of one - a man who never was. There

25X1A6a is a T/o for [REDACTED] which doesn't exist, and I made a recommendation for a man out there and they said, "No, he can't get it because a slot doesn't exist."

MR. KIRKPATRICK: He hasn't hired me.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: A slot doesn't exist.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You mean this is the T/O that never was.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We don't want to put that in here. We might break down some of the morale that we have.

Sub-paragraph 5.c. - Qualifications and Demonstrated Ability. "An employee must be fully qualified to perform the duties of the position to which his promotion is recommended. Promotions will be based on the employee's qualifications or demonstrated ability to perform work of a higher grade as evidenced by a current Personnel Evaluation Report of official record."

25X1A9a MR. SHANNON: This is where I stumble badly. Here we are penalizing the individual for the sins of his supervisor, and, damn it, it's not fair.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think I have a way around this. I think that if that Personnel Evaluation Report were current, within 90 days, or, as I do, I send a pouch out to the field and say, "We are considering so and so. He is within the zone of consideration. What are your latest considerations on him?"

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What Ted is saying is that 90 per cent of the personnel in the field couldn't be promoted today if this went into effect.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And that that is the Agency's fault. There is no requirement that we have PER's, and we haven't made it possible to make them on our people.

MR. [REDACTED]: I think this is a good basis, but it shouldn't be

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the only criteria.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And our people who ought to be promoted and ought to have the first consideration for every vacancy that exists, are just ruled out automatically by this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Shouldn't we put somewhere in this Regulation that in submitting a promotion request the PER will be submitted simultaneously?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Kirk, they don't have any PER's in the field. They don't have any form, or any guidance, or anything. And that is our fault.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We can ask for a current recommendation for a man. You remember we agreed on an in-step promotion, when he comes up for an in-step we query the field.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: For months I've been beating on tables around here. I have been in your office, to Red, to Personnel, to everybody, trying to get something out to the field on this personnel evaluation program, - even if it's pretty bad, - something, and there is still nothing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think from a practical point of view I would recommend deleting the underlined portion at this time, until we get the system working. Just end that with "higher grade".

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: All right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The next sentence: "When an employee is being considered for promotion to a position covered by a position standard published in Handbook 20-220-1, the qualification requirements contained therein

25X1A9a will be used as a basis for evaluating his qualifications."

MR. [REDACTED]: Is Handbook 20-220-1 up to date?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is a very large thing, published in sections.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It will take us, I think, three years.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This says when it is covered it will be used - when the position is covered.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't think there would be any objection to that, because everybody participates in preparing them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Paragraph 6. - Procedures. Any question on this sentence on procedures?

Paragraph 7. - Exceptions. "Any exceptions to the policies, requirements or procedures in this Regulation will be requested of the Assistant

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Director for Personnel in a memorandum of justification attached to Standard Form 52." Any objection?

Next sentence: "If the exception involves promotion to a grade higher than GS-11, the Standard Form 52 and the attached memorandum will be routed to the Assistant Director for Personnel through the appropriate Deputy Director for his indorsement."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why? Why load down the Deputy Directors with that? I don't see any point in that at all. That is what they have Career Service Boards and people like that for.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why not cut it off after "Assistant Director for Personnel"?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think the point is to establish whose signature is on the request for exception.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: That is right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: N'est-ce pas?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think the appropriate head of the Career Service - or in case of controversy in the senior grades all of them come to our DD/P Career Service Board. We have it pretty well taped out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Harry, what would you buy in lieu of the Deputy Directors' signatures?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think we are at the point where, if there is any dispute in this thing, you want to get as high in the component as you can. In some cases it may be the appropriate Deputy Director or it may be the AD Director, or the head of a Career Service Board. I think it has to be broader than just Deputy Director.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: To require it to go to the Deputy Director I think is not warranted. All he is going to do is call in the guy who would normally sign it anyway, and say, "How about this, Joe?"

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The head of the senior Career Service Board concerned?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I don't know whether anybody has a senior Career Service Board.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: The DD/A does.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have one that is across the board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, if you say "senior Career Service Board" you are actually landing on what is your senior board.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Could we settle for "the appropriate Deputy Director or

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

his designee"?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you put "or his designee" that would end up on you in your area.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And that is not appropriate as far as DD/P is concerned.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How about "the appropriate Deputy Director or his senior Career Service Board"?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: He could designate anybody he wants to review these things for him.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Actually, I would prefer, when promoting to an 11, 12 and 13, that it stay with the head of the Career Service concerned; and above that it comes to the Career Service Board.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think the level is an important consideration. The GS-11 may be too low for this kind of high level action.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have 14's and 15's coming to our senior boards.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In DD/A--this is just beginning now--all promotions to 14 or 15 go to the DD/A, not necessarily to the Board but to the DD/A himself, at least. So I think we should make a cut-off point between the 13 and 14.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why not cut this off at 14, and leave it to the Deputy--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If a grade higher than a 13 then it goes to the Deputy Director.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: "...through the appropriate Deputy Director..." and I would like to put in here "or his senior Career Service Board."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I have in here "or his designee or the head of the Career Service Board."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Will that cover you, Gene?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Yes.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: In other words, the Deputy Director will have a Career Service Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: "...the appropriate Deputy Director, or his designee or senior Career Service Board."

The next sentence reads: "The Assistant Director for Personnel will finally approve or disapprove recommendations for exception, subject to the review only by the Director of Central Intelligence." Any comment?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

Next sentence: "Exceptions will be made only when it is clearly established that: (a) An employee was initially employed at a grade below that for which he was qualified; or (b) An individual is properly qualified for promotion based partly on his experience in government...."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I object to the use of the word "government" there. "....partly on his experience prior to his entry on duty...."

. . . Off the record . . .

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Actually, Ted, "a." takes care of employment at a grade below that for which qualified if it wasn't in government. This "in government" is to take care of a problem that the DD/I has.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, I think you need both of them, and leave government out, because this can be any experience - in government, in business, robbery, or anything.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Okay. I was just explaining why that was in there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sub-paragraph c. - "Such exception is necessary to recognize and utilize an employee's outstanding ability."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I think within those three we can live very happily.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Now let's go back and rejoin the battle.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: I'd like to raise the subject of the Personnel Evaluation Report. If you don't have it for the field yet we do have it on the books for the departmental service, why can't we put something in here either excepting the field or a statement that "at such time as the Personnel Evaluation Report is installed in the field"?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why do we have to use the phrase in there at all?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Why do we have a personnel evaluation system? This, Ted, was not put in here as a needle to get people to submit personnel evaluations on time. Presumably the Personnel Evaluation Report is designed for this very purpose, to determine who is qualified and what the position is.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But isn't that clearly stated in the Regulation on the PER program, that those are to be used as a basis for determining the competence of people?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: From the point of view of practicality, we don't have the PER's in the field. I don't think you want to put it in a Regulation that if and when you put that in this applies. That is just admitting our own deficiencies. Consequently, George, the practical thing is to leave it

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

out of this thing and see if we can't lick the field problem, and if it is necessary, after this is published, we then add to it whatever we want to, but that will be months before the field can start using PER's and sending them in. 25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: You could never convince me you had a better man than I had, based on PER's, knowing how the PER's are written. I have people coming to me now raising the devil because there is a little statement here, "This person works so hard that she is endangering her health - trying to impress her ideas on people." Well, she says that damn thing forever. You would never convince me from a PER.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It wasn't designed to. You said before you process a promotion in your own Board they have to have one that was written within 90 days - you place such reliance on it within your own bailiwick.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We take a look at it but we go back to the field and ask for a narrative recommendation whether this person should be promoted or not promoted. We go through the formality of looking at the PER and if that brings something to light, that is of use to us. But we don't depend upon that at all.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You don't use the PER?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We use it normally because it is a part of a system, and once in awhile somebody will tell the truth on it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You have to find out if there is something very inconsistent.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: It's a valuable tool.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: But it shouldn't be the sole basis.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: This says as demonstrated or evidenced by a PER. I have seen promotions go through here, General, where people have been promoted and when you look at the PER those people actually should be dismissed - based on the PER.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: You have the final signature. Nobody gets promoted until you or Harry or some designated person in the Personnel Office signs off.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: There are two things wrong with them: one is that they don't tell the truth, and the second one is that a 27 year old is reporting on a 26 year old, like a captain reporting on another captain - and he's real enthusiastic about him. I would have one set of standards and

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~
~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

they would all come out. I see every damn one - EVERY ONE. I go through them all and I call in the people at home and say, "Why did you say this?" And I write the people in the field and ask "Why did you say this" or "Why not this?" Eventually we will get some pretty good PER's.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think from a practical point of view to put it in the Regulation we are licking ourselves before we start, because we do have a tremendous educational program. And I think even with the best PER we may come to the conclusion that we want a written statement with a promotion action. That is, in effect, a PER at the time. In other words, "I've looked at [REDACTED] and I have come to the following conclusions about him."

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: And we have already said someplace in here that we are making the individual go on record that this is the best qualified man that he has.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let's see if we can't wrap this up in the next 10 minutes. We have three paragraphs that are controversial from the point of view of getting us into competitive promotion system.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'll buy every one if we put on a time limit on holding up my promotion for somebody better - if we put a 30 day limit, or something like that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: We have gone over that carefully and we feel sure we can do it. 25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] If you can do it I wouldn't argue about it, but I'll admit I am hurt less than anybody else.

There is one other thing - if you tell me there is a man in TSS who is better qualified for promotion than my man and he doesn't want to come over and join my component, he should be allowed to say so.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I would recommend that in view of the fact that the DD/P area, particularly, is recoiling rather violently at this particular subject, that if the Board is willing we recommend to the full Board at the Thursday meeting that we try this out for six months and then reconsider putting it in the Regulation, and that the Regulation be issued in the meantime without it in, but at the end of a six month trial period in which promotions that are recommended the AD/Personnel will come up with the suggestions as outlined here, and see how it works on a six month trial period, And at the end of a six month period give consideration to putting it in the Regulation. Harry, would you buy that?

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Buy what?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am talking about the first sentence in paragraph 2.a.(2) and paragraph 4.d.(3).

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Right.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Paragraph 4.b.(3) is the one you want to put in.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: We are going to add a 4.b.(3).

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The ones I am talking about are the first sentence in paragraph 2.a.(2) and paragraph 4.d.(3), and I would suggest that that be formularized for the Board.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I think that is appropriate.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I'll buy that, and I don't think we can do this except on the basis of trial and error.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In that way we will be able to make the trial and if the trial doesn't succeed we won't have embarrassed ourselves in front of the Agency by trying something and then not having it work.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: I would recommend strongly, again, that paragraphs 3 and 4a. and 4b. be rewritten and simplified so that it is not confusing.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I'll leave that up to you, Harry, if you think that can be done. I would recommend that you do it. Then, on that basis, do you think you can have another draft for Thursday to let the whole Board look at it?

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: Sure.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m. . . .